

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.		FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/933,782		08/21/2001	Cornelius Wilhelmus Antonius Marie Van Overveld	NL000465	6741
24737	7590	11/23/2004	·	EXAM	IINER
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS				HIRL, JOSEPH P	
P.O. BOX 30	001				
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

2121 DATE MAILED: 11/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/933,782	VAN OVERVELD, CORNELIUS WILHELMUS ANTON
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Joseph P. Hirl	2121
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 09 November 2004 FAILS TO PLAGE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (*condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appears Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	ivoid abandonment of this application in the same application and the same application in the same app	ation. A proper reply to a h places the application in
PERIOD FOR R	EPLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing da	te of the final rejection.	
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WA 706.07(f).	later than SIX MONTHS from the mailin	g date of the final rejection.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offitimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37	of extension and the corresponding amo f the shortened statutory period for reply fice later than three months after the mai	ount of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action: or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant' 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered by	ecause:	
(a) They raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	•	,,
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ling a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claims.
NOTE:		
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	ction(s):	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).		eparate, timely filed amendment
5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request fo application in condition for allowance because: Se	r reconsideration has been consi	dered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims w	t(s) a)⊠ will not be entered or byould be rejected is provided belo	☐ will be entered and an work or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-25</u> .		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	proved or h) disapproved by t	he Evaminor
		ne Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme10. Other:	find If	
	Anthony Knight	
	Supervisory Patent Exam Group 3600	ine#1704

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicant's arguments have been fully considered but are not persuasive. Specifically:

- 1. Patents are required to be embodied in the technological arts (MPEP 2106 IV B 2 (b)) and the invention set forth in claims 1 and 8-15 are not considered to be in the technological arts.
- 2. Each of the referenced comments of the reply dated November 9, 2004 related to the 35 USC 102(e) rejection argues the related claim "specifically". The issue is that the Examiner has the obligation to intrepret each claim in the broadest reasonable manner and it is under such conditions that the prior art of Suzuki applies in each case as stated in prior office actions. Such intrepretation is fully explained in each office action in the section entitled "Examination Considerations".